

Microwave Background Signals from Tangled Magnetic Fields

Kandaswamy Subramanian^{1,2} and John D. Barrow¹

¹Astronomy Centre, University of Sussex, Brighton BN1 9QJ, UK.

²National Centre for Radio Astrophysics, TIFR, Poona University Campus, Ganeshkhind, Pune 411 007, India.

An inhomogeneous cosmological magnetic field will create Alfvén-wave modes that induce a small rotational velocity perturbation on the last scattering surface of the microwave background radiation. The Alfvén-wave mode survives Silk damping on much smaller scales than the compressional modes. This, in combination with its rotational nature, ensures that there will be no sharp cut-off in anisotropy on arc-minute scales. We estimate that a magnetic field which redshifts to a present value of 3×10^{-9} Gauss produces temperature anisotropies at the $10\mu K$ level at and below 10 arc-min scales. A tangled magnetic field, which is large enough to influence the formation of large scale structure is therefore potentially detectable by future observations.

PACS Numbers : 98.80.Cq, 98.70.Vc, 98.80.Hw

The origin of ordered, large-scale cosmic magnetic fields remains a challenging problem. It is widely assumed that magnetic fields in astronomical objects, like those in galaxies, grew by the amplification of small seed magnetic fields by turbulent dynamo action [1]. However, the efficiency of the turbulent galactic dynamo is still being debated [2]. Alternatively, the galactic field could be a remnant of a cosmological field of primordial origin [3], although, as yet, there is no entirely compelling mechanism for producing the required field. It could be present in the initial conditions, be produced quantum gravitationally or at a phase transition, or be generated in some way at the end of a period of inflation [4]. A primordial field that expanded to contribute a present field strength of order 10^{-9} Gauss, tangled on galactic scales, could also impact significantly on galaxy formation [5,6]. It is of considerable interest, therefore, to find different ways of limiting or detecting such primordial fields [8]. We argue that observations of anisotropies in the cosmic microwave background radiation (CMBR), provide a potentially powerful constraint on such fields. Indeed, earlier work has found that the isotropy of the CMBR already places a limit of $6.8 \times 10^{-9}(\Omega_0 h^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ Gauss on the present strength of any *uniform* (spatially homogeneous) component of the magnetic field [9]. (Ω_0 is the present density parameter, and h the Hubble constant in units of $100kms^{-1}Mpc^{-1}$.) Here, we obtain comparable constraints on tangled (inhomogeneous) magnetic fields as well and highlight the distinctive fluctuation signature that they are expected to leave in the small-scale structure of the CMBR.

We build on the results of an earlier paper [6], where we considered the evolution and damping of cosmic magnetic fields in the early universe. We showed that inhomogeneous magnetic fields induce rotational Alfvén modes as well as compressional density and velocity perturbations (see also ref. [7]). The compressional fluid perturbations are of small amplitude ($\sim V_A^2 \ll 1$) on all scales, because of the restoring force contributed by the pressure of the radiation-baryon fluid. Here, V_A is the Alfvén velocity in the radiation era of the universe (see eqn. (5)

below) and we set $c = 1$. Compressional modes are also strongly damped on scales smaller than the comoving photon diffusion length, L_S , by Silk damping [10]. However, the *rotational* component of the fluid velocity, induced by tangled magnetic fields, can be much larger (a significant fraction of V_A). Two features are important. First, the restoring force is much weaker (since radiation-baryon pressure does not affect this mode), and furthermore, these velocity perturbations survive damping on comoving scales larger than $L_A \sim V_A L_S$ [6]. It is these rotational velocity perturbations, induced by the tangled field, which can produce significant small angular scale anisotropies in the CMBR, through the Doppler effect.

We calculate this effect in two steps. First we calculate the anisotropy at small angular scales produced by a general rotational component of the velocity, due to the Doppler effect. Then we estimate the magnitude of this rotational component for a given spectrum of magnetic inhomogeneities.

The equation governing the evolution of temperature perturbation $\Delta T(\mathbf{x}, \gamma, \tau_0)/T_0$, can be derived from the moments of the Boltzmann equation for photons [11]. Here, $\mathbf{x}$ is the comoving position, τ is conformal time, τ_0 its present value, and γ is the direction of photon propagation. It is conventional to expand $\Delta T/T_0 = \sum_{lm} a_{lm} Y_{lm}(\gamma)$ and define $C_l = \langle |a_{lm}|^2 \rangle$. For rotational velocity perturbations a detailed calculation of C_l has been done in Ref. [12] and [13] in the context of computing the Vishniac effect, and we can adopt their final result. We have (from Eqs. (5) and (16) of [13]),

$$C_l = 4\pi \int_0^\infty \frac{k^2 dk}{2\pi^2} \frac{l(l+1)}{2} \times \langle \left| \int_0^{\tau_0} d\tau g(\tau_0, \tau) V(k, \tau) \frac{j_l(k(\tau_0 - \tau))}{k(\tau_0 - \tau)} \right|^2 \rangle. \quad (1)$$

Here, $V(k, \tau)$ is the Fourier transform of the rotational component of the fluid velocity, with k the co-moving wave number, and $j_l(z)$ is the spherical Bessel function of order l . The 'visibility function', $g(\tau_0, \tau)$, de-

termines the probability that a photon reaches us at the epoch τ_0 if it was last scattered at the epoch τ . It is given by $g(\tau, \tau') = \dot{\kappa} \exp[-\int_{\tau'}^{\tau} \dot{\kappa}(\tau'') d\tau'']$, where $\dot{\kappa}(\tau) = n_e(\tau) \sigma_T a(\tau)$, n_e is the electron number density, σ_T is the Thomson cross section, and $a(\tau)$ is the cosmological scale factor normalised to unity at the present. We also adopt a flat universe throughout.

For standard recombination physics, g is peaked about a small range of conformal times around the time of recombination. For the present purpose of making approximate analytical estimates, it suffices to approximate it as a Gaussian, and take $g(\tau_0, \tau') = (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-1/2} \exp[-(\tau' - \tau_*)^2/(2\sigma^2)]$, where τ_* is the conformal epoch of “last scattering” and σ measures the width of the last scattering surface (LSS). Using the expressions given in Ref. [14], we estimate $\tau_* \sim 178.2 h^{-1} \text{Mpc}$ and $\sigma = 11.1 h^{-1} \text{Mpc}$. Note that due to the visibility function, the dominant contributions to the integral over τ in Eq. (1) come from conformal times in a range σ around the epoch $\tau = \tau_*$. The presence of $j_l(k(\tau_0 - \tau))$ picks out (k, τ) values in the integrand which have $k(\tau_0 - \tau) \sim l$.

We can obtain analytic estimates of C_l in two limits. First, for wavelengths such that $k\sigma \ll 1$, $k(\tau_0 - \tau)$, and hence $j_l(k(\tau_0 - \tau))$, vary negligibly over the range of τ where g is significant. So they can be evaluated at $\tau = \tau_*$ and taken out of the integral over τ in Eq. (1). Furthermore, in general, $V(k, \tau)$ does not vary rapidly with conformal time within σ , nor does it vary rapidly with k in the k range around $k \sim l/R_*$ where $j_l(kR_*)$ contributes dominantly (we define $R_* = \tau_0 - \tau_*$). Thus, V can also be evaluated at $\tau = \tau_*$ and $k = l/R_*$ and pulled out of the integrals. The remaining integral of g over τ gives unity, while that over j_l^2 can be done analytically, giving

$$\frac{l(l+1)C_l}{2\pi} \approx \frac{\pi}{4} \Delta_V^2(k = lR_*^{-1}, \tau_*). \quad (2)$$

where, $\Delta_V^2(k, \tau_*) = k^3 \langle |V(k, \tau_*)|^2 \rangle / (2\pi^2)$ is the power per unit logarithmic interval of k , residing in the rotational velocity perturbation V .

In the other limit, $k\sigma \gg 1$, for wavelengths much smaller than the thickness of the LSS, one can treat g as a slowly-varying function compared to j_l in the integral over τ in (1). There is a cancellation due to superposition of oscillating contributions of j_l over the thickness of the LSS. An approximate evaluation of the angular power spectrum in this case gives

$$\frac{l(l+1)C_l}{2\pi} \approx \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{4} \frac{\Delta_V^2(k, \tau_*)}{k\sigma} \Big|_{k=l/R_*}. \quad (3)$$

Note that in this small-wavelength case, ($k\sigma \gg 1$), the angular power-spectrum is suppressed by a $1/k\sigma$ factor due to the finite thickness of the LSS. We can now evaluate the CMBR anisotropies produced by tangled magnetic fields.

We will assume that the tangled magnetic field is initially a Gaussian random field. When the Hubble radius grows to encompass tangles on any particular scale,

the Lorentz force associated with the magnetic inhomogeneity induces a fluid velocity. One would like to estimate the rotational component of this velocity, for a general spectrum of magnetic inhomogeneities. Before doing this however, we first consider the simpler example of the special *non-linear* cosmological Alfvén wave solution discussed in [6]. This will allow us to estimate in a simpler context the magnitude of the CMBR anisotropy induced by a tangled magnetic field.

We showed in [6], that the equations of relativistic, viscous, magnetohydrodynamics are conformally invariant during the epochs when the radiation energy density dominates over the baryon density. We exploited this to transform the MHD equations from the Friedmann universe to flat spacetime, and studied a special nonlinear Alfvén mode solution. In this solution, the magnetic field $\mathbf{B}$ is split into a uniform field, say along the $\mathbf{z}$ direction, and a tangled component of *arbitrary strength*, perpendicular to $\mathbf{z}$. All variables depend only on z and τ . In particular, $\mathbf{B} = [B_0 \mathbf{z} + b_0(z, \tau) \mathbf{n}]/a^2$, where $\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{z} = 0$. The tangled field, $b_0(z, \tau)$, can be arbitrarily large compared to B_0 and satisfies a linear damped wave equation. Expanding the magnetic inhomogeneity in plane wave modes, as $b_0(z, \tau) = f(k, \tau) e^{ikz}$, this is, [6],

$$\ddot{f} + \frac{\eta(\tau)k^2}{(\rho + p)a} \dot{f} + k^2 V_A^2 f = 0. \quad (4)$$

Here, derivatives are with respect to conformal time. The associated velocity perturbation is given by $\mathbf{v}(z, \tau) = v_0(k, \tau) e^{ikz} \mathbf{n}$; from the induction equation, $v_0(k, \tau) = -i\dot{f}/(kB_0)$. In Eq.(4), $\eta = (4/15)\rho_\gamma l_\gamma$ is the shear viscosity coefficient associated with the damping due to photons, whose energy density is ρ_γ and mean-free-path is l_γ . We have also defined the Alfvén velocity V_A by

$$V_A = \frac{B_0/a^2}{(4\pi(\rho + p))^{1/2}} = \frac{B_0}{(4\pi(\rho_0 + p_0))^{1/2}} \approx 3.8 \times 10^{-4} B_{-9}. \quad (5)$$

where ρ and p are the energy density and pressure of the relativistic radiation-baryon fluid; ρ_0 and p_0 their redshifted present-day values and B_0 the present field strength assuming the field is simply frozen into the uniformly expanding universe. To obtain a numerical estimate, we have expressed B_0 in units of 10^{-9} Gauss and taken the dominant contribution to the energy density $\rho = \rho_\gamma$, the photon energy density, as is appropriate in the radiation era after the epoch of e^+e^- annihilation.

We can solve Eq.(4) analytically in two limits. For scales (or k^{-1}), larger than the comoving Silk scale at recombination, which is $L_S \sim (l_\gamma(t_*)t_*)^{1/2}/a(t_*)$, and assuming the fluid starts from rest, we can neglect the frictional term compared to the driving term in eq. (4). (Here t is the usual cosmic time). Since $\dot{f}(\tau_i) = 0$ at some initial time, say τ_i , we have $f = f_0(k) \cos[kV_A(\tau - \tau_i)]$ and $v_0(k, \tau) =$

$(f_0(k)/iB_0)V_A \sin[kV_A(\tau - \tau_i)]$. For a flat universe, composed of radiation and matter, we can integrate the Friedmann equation to obtain $\tau = 6000h^{-1}[\sqrt{a + \Omega_\gamma} - \sqrt{\Omega_\gamma}]$ Mpc. The phase of oscillation is then $\chi = kV_A(\tau - \tau_i) \approx 10^{-2}B_{-9}(k/(0.2h\text{Mpc}^{-1}))(\tau/\tau_*)$, where we assume $\tau_* \gg \tau_i$, and adopt a LSS redshift, $z_* \sim 1100$. Since $\chi \ll 1$, $v_0(k, \tau_*) \approx (f_0(k)/iB_0)kV_A^2\tau_* \sim 0.86 \times 10^{-5}(f_0(k)/iB_0)(k/0.05h\text{Mpc}^{-1})(B_{-9}/3)^2$. (One can also check from this solution that the neglect of the $\dot{f}$ term is a good approximation for $kL_S < 1$). The associated CMBR anisotropy will depend on the orientation of the tangled and large-scale fields with respect to the line of sight. A rough estimate of the maximum signal for $kL_S \ll 1$ is

$$\Delta T \sim T_0|v_0| \sim 23.3\mu K(k/0.05h\text{Mpc}^{-1})(B_{-9}/3)^2; \quad (6)$$

where T_0 is the present mean temperature of the smooth CMBR. We have assumed that the tangled and uniform field components are of the same order. (Also, on these scales $k\sigma < 0.5$, and there is negligible damping of anisotropies due to the finite LSS thickness).

In the opposite limit $kL_S \gg 1$, damping due to photon viscosity dominates, and one can assume the fluid reaches a terminal velocity, where $\ddot{f} \approx 0$, so $v_0 \approx (if/B_0)5V_A^2/(kL_\gamma(\tau)) \sim 0.76 \times 10^{-5}(if/B_0)(B_{-9}/3)^2(k/0.25h)^{-1}f_b h^{-1}$. Here, the quantity $L_\gamma = l_\gamma(\tau_*)/a(\tau_*) \sim 3.4\text{Mpc}f_b^{-1}$, is the comoving photon mean-free-path at last scattering. We have also defined $f_b \equiv (\Omega_b/0.0125h^{-2})$, Ω_b being the present baryonic density parameter (see Eq. (4.12) of Ref. [6]). The oscillator is overdamped on the relevant scales, [6]. Thus, the solution with $\dot{f}(\tau_i) = 0$ will have $f \sim f_0$. Further, since L_S and σ are comparable, we have $k\sigma > 1$, and so there will be a $(k\sigma)^{-1/2}$ suppression in the observed anisotropy due to the finite thickness of the LSS. Therefore, in this case we predict that, for $kL_S \gg 1$,

$$\Delta T \sim \frac{T_0 c_0 |v_0|}{\sqrt{k\sigma}} \sim 12.5\mu K \left(\frac{B_{-9}}{3}\right)^2 \left(\frac{k}{0.25h\text{Mpc}^{-1}}\right)^{-3/2} \times c_0 h^{-1} f_b; \quad (7)$$

Again, we have assumed comparable tangled and homogeneous fields. The geometrical factor $c_0 < 1$ incorporates the unknown orientation of the large-scale field and the small-scale tangles, together with the precise form of the LSS thickness suppression effects. We see that in both limits, (6)-(7) small angular scale CMBR anisotropies $\sim 10\mu K$ could arise for magnetic fields $B_0 \sim 3 \times 10^{-9}$ Gauss.

Let us now turn to a more general calculation of the magnetically induced rotational-velocity perturbation, in the case when the fields are initially stochastic with Gaussian probability distribution. On galactic scales and above, the induced velocity is generally so small that it does not lead to any appreciable distortion of the initial field (see above and [6]). So, to a very good approximation, one can assume that the evolution of the

magnetic field is simply a dilution due to the uniform Hubble expansion, with $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x}, t) = \mathbf{b}_0(\mathbf{x})/a^2$. (Here we assume $\mathbf{b}_0$ does not include any uniform component.) The Lorentz force associated with the tangled field is then given by $\mathbf{F}_L = (\nabla \times \mathbf{b}_0) \times \mathbf{b}_0/(4\pi a^5)$. The Lorentz force still pushes on the fluid, causing rotational velocity perturbations. We also focus on the perturbations with co-moving length scales larger than the photon mean-free-path at decoupling, and describe the viscous effect due to photons, as before, in the diffusion approximation. The Fourier transform of the linearised Euler equation for the rotational perturbations in the baryon-photon fluid is given by

$$\left(\frac{4}{3}\rho_\gamma + \rho_b\right) \frac{\partial V_i}{\partial t} + \left[\frac{\rho_b}{a} \frac{da}{dt} + \frac{k^2 \eta}{a^2}\right] V_i = \frac{P_{ij} F_j}{4\pi a^5}. \quad (8)$$

Here we have defined the Fourier transforms of the magnetic field, $\mathbf{b}_0(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{k}) \exp(i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x})$ and the velocity field, $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}, t) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{k}, t) \exp(i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x})$, where $\mathbf{V} \cdot \mathbf{k} = 0$ for the transverse (vortical) part of the velocity. Also ρ_b is the baryon density. The fact that the Lorentz force is non-linear in $\mathbf{b}_0(\mathbf{x})$, leads to the mode-coupling term $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_{\mathbf{p}} [\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{p}) \cdot \mathbf{b}^*(\mathbf{p})] \mathbf{p} - [\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{b}^*(\mathbf{p})] \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{p})$, and the projection tensor, $P_{ij}(\mathbf{k}) = [\delta_{ij} - k_i k_j / k^2]$ projects $\mathbf{F}$ onto its transverse components (perpendicular to $\mathbf{k}$).

As before, we can solve Eq.(8) analytically, on scales much larger or much smaller than the Silk scale. For $kL_S < 1$, and when the fluid starts from rest ($V_i(\tau_i) = 0$), the damping due to the photon viscosity can be neglected compared to the driving due to the Lorentz force. Integrating the resulting first-order equation gives $V_i = G_i(\tau - \tau_i)/(1 + S_*)$, where we have defined $G_i = P_{ij} F_j / [4\pi(\rho_0 + p_0)]$ and $S_* = (3\rho_b/4\rho_\gamma)(\tau_*) \sim 0.4f_b$. The $(1 + S_*)$ factor results from the reduction in the induced velocity due to baryon inertia, an effect neglected in the non-linear Alfvén wave solution above. One can also check from this solution that the neglect of viscous damping is valid for $kL_S < 1$. In the other limit, with $kL_S \gg 1$, we can use the terminal-velocity approximation, neglecting the inertial terms in the Euler equation, and simply balance the Lorentz force by friction. This leads to $V_i = (G_i/k)(kL_\gamma/5)^{-1}$.

To calculate the induced CMBR anisotropy, we need to define the spectrum of the tangled magnetic field, $M(k)$. We define, $\langle b_i(\mathbf{k}) b_j(\mathbf{q}) \rangle = \delta_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}} P_{ij}(\mathbf{k}) M(k)$, where $\delta_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}}$ is the Kronecker delta which is non-zero only for $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{q}$. With this definition we also have $\langle \mathbf{b}_0^2 \rangle = 2 \int (dk/k) \Delta_b^2(k)$, where $\Delta_b^2(k) = k^3 M(k)/(2\pi^2)$ is the power per logarithmic interval in k space residing in magnetic tangles, and we have changed the summation over k space to an integration. The ensemble average $\langle |V|^2 \rangle = \langle V_i V_i^* \rangle$, and hence the C_l s, can be computed in terms of the magnetic spectrum $M(k)$. It is convenient to define a dimensionless spectrum, say $h(k) = \Delta_b^2(k)/(B_0^2/2)$, where B_0 is a fiducial constant magnetic field. We will also define the Alfvén velocity, V_A , for this fiducial field, using Eq.(5). Fi-

nally, as a measure of the CMBR anisotropy induced by the tangled magnetic field, we define the quantity $\Delta T_B(l) = \{l(l+1)C_l/2\pi\}^{1/2}T_0$.

Since scales with $kL_s < 1$ also generally satisfy the criterion $k\sigma < 1$, the resulting CMBR anisotropy on these scales can be estimated using Eq.(2). A lengthy but straightforward calculation gives, for scales with $kL_s < 1$ and $k\sigma < 1$,

$$\Delta T_B(l) = T_0 \left(\frac{\pi}{32}\right)^{1/2} I(k) \frac{kV_A^2 \tau_*}{(1+S_*)} \approx 5.4\mu K \left(\frac{B_{-9}}{3}\right)^2 \left(\frac{l}{300}\right) I\left(\frac{l}{R_*}\right) \quad (9)$$

Here, $l = kR_*$ as before, $S_* = 0.4$, and we have again assumed $\tau_* \gg \tau_i$.

For scales with $kL_s > 1$ and $k\sigma > 1$, we can use Eq.(3), and $V_i = (G_i/k)(kL_\gamma/5)^{-1}$. In this case a similar calculation to the one performed above gives

$$\Delta T_B(l) = T_0 \frac{\pi^{1/4}}{\sqrt{32}} I(k) \frac{5V_A^2}{kL_\gamma(\tau_*)(k\sigma)^{1/2}} \approx 5.6\mu K \left(\frac{B_{-9}}{3}\right)^2 \left(\frac{l}{1500}\right)^{-3/2} h_{50}^{-1} I\left(\frac{l}{R_*}\right) \quad (10)$$

where $h_{50} = (h/0.5)$ and we have taken $f_b = 1$. (Also, for the diffusion approximation to be valid, $kL_\gamma(\tau_*) < 1$.)

The function $I^2(k)$ in the eqs.(9)-(10) is a dimensionless mode-coupling integral given by

$$I^2(k) = \int_0^\infty \frac{dq}{q} \int_{-1}^1 d\mu \frac{h(q)h(|\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}|)k^3}{(k^2+q^2+2kq\mu)^{3/2}} \times (1-\mu^2) \left[1 + \frac{(k+2q\mu)(k+q\mu)}{(k^2+q^2+2kq\mu)}\right] \quad (11)$$

where $|\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}| = (k^2+q^2+2kq\mu)^{1/2}$. In general, $I(k)$ can only be evaluated numerically. We will do this elsewhere, but its order of magnitude contribution can be estimated from the following simple case. Suppose the magnetic spectrum has a single scale, with $h(k) = k\delta_D(k-k_0)$, where $\delta_D(x)$ is the Dirac delta function). In that case $\langle \mathbf{b}_0^2 \rangle = B_0^2$ and the field points in random directions but has a unique scale k_0^{-1} . The mode-coupling integral can be evaluated exactly for such a spectrum. We find that $I(k) = (k/k_0)[1-(k/2k_0)^2]^{1/2}$, for $k < 2k_0$, and zero for larger k . One can see that $I(k)$ contributes a factor of order unity around $k \sim k_0$, with $I(k_0) = \sqrt{3}/2$. For more complicated magnetic spectrum, with a multitude of scales, $I(k)$ can be thought of as a superposition of these elementary contributions, and could be somewhat larger.

From Eqs.(9)-(10), we see that in general for a tangled field of order $B_0 \sim 3 \times 10^{-9}G$, one expects a RMS CMBR anisotropy of order $5\mu K$ or larger, depending on the contribution of $I(k)$ and the value of l . The anisotropy in hot or cold spots could be several times larger, because the

non-linear dependence of C_l on $M(k)$ will imply a non-Gaussian statistics for the anisotropies. It should also be emphasised that in standard models the C_l s have a sharp cut off for $l > R_*/L_s$, due to Silk damping. But strong damping of Alfvénic perturbations is expected only on scales smaller than $V_A L_s$ [6]. Moreover, for small scale rotational perturbations, the damping due to the finite thickness of the LSS is also milder than for compressional modes. We note in passing that such rotational perturbations could also induce a “magnetic” type polarisation anisotropy. We will estimate this effect elsewhere.

Several satellite and interferometric experiments are planned which will map the small angular scale anisotropies at the levels that these calculations predict. We have identified a new physical effect which can produce a detectable signal in the microwave background on arc minute scales. If magnetic fields play a role in the development of large-scale structure in the Universe then we should be able to detect the effects of tangled primordial magnetic fields.

Acknowledgments: The authors were both supported by PPARC. KS also thanks Simon White and the Max-Planck Institute for Astrophysics, Garching, Rainer Beck, Richard Wielebinski and the Max-Planck Institut for Radio Astronomy, Bonn for hospitality during the course of this work, and T. R. Seshadri for a useful discussion.

-
- [1] A. A. Ruzmaikin, A. Shukurov and D. Sokoloff, *Magnetic Fields of Galaxies*, Kluwer, Dordrecht (1988); L. Mestel, *Stellar Magnetism*, Oxford UP, Oxford, (1998); R. Beck, A. Brandenburg, D. Moss, A. Shukurov and D. Sokoloff, D., Ann. Rev. A. & A., **34**, 155 (1996).
 - [2] F. Cattaneo and S. I. Vainshtein, Ap.J., **376**, L21 (1991); R. M. Kulsrud and S. W. Anderson, Ap.J., **396**, 606 (1992); Brandenburg, A., In *Lectures on Solar and Planetary Dynamos*, ed. M. R. E. Proctor and A. D. Gilbert, CUP., (1994), p117; E. T. Vishniac, Ap. J. **446**, 724 (1995); E. Blackman, Phys. Rev. Lett., **77**, 2694 (1996); F. Cattaneo and D. W. Hughes, Phys. Rev E, **54**, 4532 (1996); K. Subramanian, MNRAS, **294**, 718 (1998).
 - [3] R. M. Kulsrud, IAU Symp. 140: *Galactic and Extragalactic Magnetic Fields*, Reidel, Dordrecht, (1990), p527.
 - [4] C. J. Hogan, Phys. Rev. Lett., **51**, 1488 (1983); M. S. Turner and L. M. Widrow, Phys. Rev. D, **30**, 2743 (1988); T. Vachaspati, Phys. Lett. B, **265**, 258 (1991). B. Ratra, Ap.J. Lett., **391**, L1 (1992); M. Gasperini, M. Giovannini and G. Veneziano, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 3796 (1995); D. Lemoine and M. Lemoine, Phys. Rev. D, **52**, 1955 (1995); O. Törnkvist, hep-ph/9707513; K. Enqvist, astro-ph/9707300; M. Giovannini and M. E. Shaposhnikov, hep-ph/9710234; M. Joyce and M. E. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Rev. Lett., **79**, 1193 (1997).
 - [5] I. Wasserman, Ap.J., **224**, 337 (1978)

- [6] K. Subramanian and J. D. Barrow, astro-ph/9712083.
- [7] K. Jedamzik, V. Katalinic, and A. Olinto, astro-ph/9606080 v2. (Phys. Rev. D in Press).
- [8] P. P. Kronberg, Rep. Prog. Phys., **57**, 325 (1994).
- [9] J. D. Barrow, P. G. Ferreira and J. Silk, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 3610 (1997); Barrow, J. D., Phys. Rev. D **55**, 7451 (1997).
- [10] J. Silk, Ap. J., **151**, 431 (1968).
- [11] C-P Ma and E. Bertschinger, Ap.J., **455**, 7 (1995).
- [12] J. P. Ostriker and E. T. Vishniac, Ap.J. Lett., **306**, L51 (1986); E. T. Vishniac, Ap.J., **322**, 597 (1987).
- [13] W. Hu and M. White, Astron. Astrophys., **315**, 33 (1996).
- [14] W. Hu, and N. Sugiyama, Ap.J., **444**, 489 (1995).